

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended.

No new matter is added.

Claims 1-8 are currently pending.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,061,443 to Black et al. (“Black”). Applicants respectfully submit that Black does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites a suction valve for a small hermetic compressor comprising a flexible vane comprising a “fixation end portion” and a “higher bending region”:

wherein the distance between an external edge of the flexible vane and its adjacent internal edge portion of the median opening diminishes, progressively, along a higher bending region of the flexible vane of the valve, from a maximum value, close to the end fixation portion, to a minimum value, close to the boundary of the higher bending region of the flexible vane.

Applicants respectfully submit that Black does not disclose at least these features of the presently claimed invention.

Black describes a variable stroke compressor having inlet reeds 147. In asserting that Black anticipates the presently claimed invention, the Examiner relies on Figure 5, a cross-sectional illustration showing the inlet reed valve disc having inlet reeds 147. Applicants thank the Examiner

for the depiction of Figure 5 included in the Office Action clarifying the Examiner's assertions. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner mischaracterizes Black and the present invention in asserting Black as an anticipatory reference.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's depiction does not disclose a "fixation end *portion*" (emphasis added) as recited in the presently claimed invention. The depiction merely includes a "fixation end," referring to the tip of the inlet reed 147. In contrast, the "fixation end portion" of the presently claimed invention, for example, refers to a segment of the flexible vane 10 (as indicated by reference indicator 11 in Figure 1). The omission of asserting a feature that discloses a "fixation end portion" allows the Examiner to mistakenly assert that Black discloses a "higher bending region," as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. The Examiner's "higher bending region" of Black's inlet reed 147 is actually more akin to the "fixed end portion" of the claimed invention. Once you pass Black's "fixed end portion" and travel along the inlet reed 147, you now reach the higher bending region, wherein the width does not decrease.

In contrast, as claimed in the present invention "the distance between an external edge of the flexible vane and its adjacent internal edge portion of the median opening diminishes, progressively," along the "higher bending region." Further, as described in the Specification, the "higher bending region," for example, "extends from the fixation end portion 11 to about 50%-60% the length of the flexible vane 10." *See* U.S. Publication Number 2006/0096647, ¶[0028].

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Black does not anticipate claim 1, and request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1. By virtue of their dependency, and for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Black does not anticipate claims 2 and 5, and request that the rejection of claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 4, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Black in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,764,091 to Ikeda et al. (“Ikeda”).

Ikeda describes a piston type compressor having a cylinder block.

Claims 3, 4, and 8 depend from claim 1, and Ikeda does not cure the deficiencies of Black. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black in view of the Examiner’s statement of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1, and the Examiner’s statement of ordinary skill in the art does not cure the deficiencies of Black. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Black in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,266,016 to Kandpal. Applicants respectfully traverse in that Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and Kandpal does not cure the deficiencies of Black. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit same. If the Examiner believes there are any remaining issues which can be resolved by a Supplemental Amendment or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: September 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DelJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicants